arXiv:0704.1700v1 [math.AC] 13 Apr 2007

RETRACT RATIONALITY AND NOETHER'S PROBLEM

Ming-chang Kang

Department of Mathematics

National Taiwan University

Taipei, Taiwan, Rep. of China

E-mail: kang@math.ntu.edu.tw

Abstract. Let K be any field and G be a finite group. Let G act on the rational function fields $K(x_g : g \in G)$ by K-automorphisms defined by $g \cdot x_h = x_{gh}$ for any $g, h \in G$. Denote by $K(G)$ the fixed field $K(x_g : g \in G)^G$. Noether's problem asks whether $K(G)$ is rational (=purely transcendental) over K. We will prove that, if K is any field, p an odd prime number, and G is a non-abelian group of exponent p with $|G| = p^3$ or p^4 satisfying $[K(\zeta_p) : K] \leq 2$, then $K(G)$ is rational over K. A notion of retract rationality is introduced by Saltman in case $K(G)$ is not rational. We will also show that $K(G)$ is retract rational if G belongs to a much larger class of p-groups. In particular, generic G-polynomials of G-Galois extensions exist for these groups.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: Primary 12F12, 13A50, 11R32, 14E08.

Keywords and Phrases: Noether's problem, rationality problem, retract rational, generic polynomial, p-groups of exponent p, flabby class maps, projective modules.

§1. Introduction

Let K be any field and G be a finite group. Let G act on the rational function field $K(x_g : g \in G)$ by K-automorphisms defined by $g \cdot x_h = x_{gh}$ for any $g, h \in G$. Denote $K(G) := K(x_g : g \in G)^G$ the fixed subfield under the action of G. Noether's problem asks whether $K(G)$ is rational (= purely transcendental) over K.

Noether's problem for abelian groups was studied by Fischer, Furtwängler, K. Masuda, Swan, Voskresenskii, S. Endo and T. Miyata, Lenstra, etc. It was known that $K(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is rational if $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is a cyclic group of order p with $p = 3, 5, 7$ or 11. The first counter-example was found by Swan: $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{Z}_{47})$ is not rational over $\mathbb{Q}$ [Sw1]. However Saltman showed that $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ is retract rational over K for any prime number p, which is enough to ensure the existence of a generic Galois G-extension and will fulfill the original purpose of Emmy Noether [Sa1]. For the convenience of the reader, we recall the definition of retract rationality.

Definition 1.1. ([Sa3]) Let $K \subset L$ be a field extension. We say that L is retract rational over K, if there is a K-algebra R contained in L such that (i) L is the quotient field of R, and (ii) the identity map $1_R : R \to R$ factors through a localized polynomial K-algebra, i.e. there is an element $f \in K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ the polynomial ring over K and there are K-algebra homomorphisms $\varphi : R \to K[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f]$ and $\psi : K[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f] \to R$ satisfying $\psi \circ \varphi = 1_R$.

It is not difficult to see that "rational" $\Rightarrow$ "stably rational" $\Rightarrow$ "retract rational".

One of the motivation to study Noether's problem arises from the inverse Galois problem. If K is an infinite field, it is known that $K(G)$ is retract rational over K if and only if there exists a generic Galois G-extension over K [Sa1, Theorem 5.3; Sa3, Theorem 3.12], which guarantees the existence of a Galois G-extension of K, provided that K is a Hilbertian field. On the other hand, the existence of a generic Galois G-extension over K is equivalent to the existence of a generic polynomial for G. For the relationship among these notions, see [DM]. For a survey of Noether's problem the reader is referred to articles of Swan and Kersten [Sw2; Ke].

Although Noether's problem for abelian groups was investigated extensively, our knowledge for the non-abelian Noether's problem was amazingly scarce (see, for example, [Ka2]). We will list below some previous results of non-abelian Noether's problem, which are relevant to the theme of this article.

Theorem 1.2. (Saltman [Sa2]) *For any prime number p and for any field K with char $K \neq p$ (in particular, K may be an algebraically closed field), there is a meta-abelian p-group G of order p^9 such that $K(G)$ is not retract rational over K. In particular, it is not rational.*

Theorem 1.3. (Hajja [Ha]) *Let G be a finite group containing an abelian normal subgroup N such that G/N is a cyclic group of order < 23. Then $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is rational over $\mathbb{C}$.*

Theorem 1.4. (Chu and Kang [CK]) *Let p be a prime number, G be a p-group of order $\leq p^4$ with exponent p^e. Let K be any field such that either char $K = p$ or char $K \neq p$ and K contains a primitive p^e-th root of unity. Then $K(G)$ is rational over K.*

Theorem 1.5. (Kang [Ka4]) *Let G be a metacyclic p-group with exponent p^e, and let K be any field such that* (i) *char $K = p$, or* (ii) *char $K \neq p$ and K contains a primitive p^e-th root of unity. Then $K(G)$ is rational over K.*

Note that, in Theorems 1.3—1.5, it is assumed that the ground field contains enough roots of unity. We may wonder whether $\mathbb{Q}(G)$ is rational if G is a non-abelian p-group of small order. The answer is rather optimistic when G is a group of order 8 or 16.

Theorem 1.6. ([CHK; Ka3]) *Let K be any field and G be any non-abelian group of order 8 or 16 other than the generalized quaternion group of order 16. Then $K(G)$ is always rational over K.*

However Serre was able to show that $\mathbb{Q}(G)$ is not rational when G is the generalized quaternion group [Se, p.441–442; GMS, Theorem 33.26 and Example 33.27, p.89–90].

On the other hand, if p is an odd prime number, Saltman proves the following theorem.

Theorem 1.7. (Saltman [Sa4]) *Let p be an odd prime number and G be a non-abelian group of order p^3. If K is a field containing a primitive p-th root of unity, then $K(G)$ is stably rational.*

The above theorem may be generalized to the case of p-groups containing a maximal cyclic subgroup, namely,

Theorem 1.8. (Hu and Kang [HuK]) *Let p be a prime number and G be a non-abelian p-group of order p^n containing a cyclic subgroup of index p. If K is any field containing a primitive p^{n-2}-th root of unity, then $K(G)$ is rational over K.*

In this article we will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.9. *Let p be an odd prime number, G be the non-abelian group of exponent p and of order p^3 or p^4. If K is a field with $[K(\zeta_p) : K] \leq 2$, then $K(G)$ is rational over K.*

The rationality problem of $K(G)$ seems rather intricate if the ground field K has no enough root of unity. We don't know the answer to the rationality of $K(G)$ when the assumption that $[K(\zeta_p) : K] \leq 2$ is waived in the above theorem. On the other hand, as to the retract rationality of $K(G)$, a lot of information may be obtained. Before stating our results, we recall a theorem of Saltman first.

Theorem 1.10. (Saltman [Sa1, Theorem 3.5]) *Let K be a field, $G = A \rtimes G_0$ be a semi-direct product group where A is an abelian normal subgroup of G. Assume that gcd$\{|A|, |G_0|\} = 1$ and both $K(A)$ and $K(G_0)$ are retract rational over K. Then $K(G)$ is retract rational over K.*

Thus the main problem is to investigate the retract rationality for p-groups. We will prove $K(G)$ is retract rational for many p-groups G of exponent p.

Theorem 1.11. *Let p be a prime number, K be any field, and $G = A \rtimes G_0$ be a semi-direct product group where A is a normal elementary p-group of G and G_0 is a cyclic group of order p^m. If $p = 2$ and $\operatorname{char} K \neq 2$, assume furthermore that $K(\zeta_{2^m})$ is a cyclic extension of K. Then $K(G)$ is retract rational over K.*

If p is an odd prime number, a p-group of exponent p containing an abelian normal subgroup of index p certainly satisfies the assumption in Theorem 1.11. In particular, a p-group of exponent p and of order p^3 or p^4 belongs to this class of p-groups (see [CK]). There are six p-groups of exponent p and of order p^5; only four of them contain abelian normal subgroups of index p. Previously the retract rationality of $K(G)$ for non-abelian p-groups, i.e. the existence of generic polynomials for such groups G, is known only when G is of order p^3 and of exponent p.

Similarly if $G = A \rtimes G_0$ is a semi-direct product of p-groups such that A is a normal subgroup of order p, and G_0 is a direct product of an elementary p-group with a cyclic group of order p^m, then G also satisfies the assumption in Theorem 1.11 provided that the assumption that $K(\zeta_{2^m})$ is a cyclic extension of K remains in force.

The above Theorem 1.11 is deduced from the following theorem.

Theorem 1.12. *Let K be any field, and $G = A \rtimes G_0$ be a semi-direct product group where A is a normal abelian subgroup of exponent e and G_0 is a cyclic group of order m. Assume that*

(i) *either $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ or $\operatorname{char} K > 0$ with $\operatorname{char} K \nmid em$, and*

(ii) *both $K(\zeta_e)$ and $K(\zeta_m)$ are cyclic extensions of K such that $\gcd\{m, [K(\zeta_e) : K]\} = 1$.*

Then $K(G)$ is retract rational over K.

The idea of the proof of Theorem 1.12 is to add a primitive e-th root of unity to the ground field and the question is reduced to a question of multiplicative group actions. It is Voskresenskii who realizes that the multiplicative group action is related to the birational classification of algebraic tori [Vo]. However, the multiplicative group action arising in the present situation is not the function field of an algebraic torus; it is a new type of multiplicative group actions. Thus we need a new criterion for retract rationality. It is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.13. *Let π_1 and π_2 be finite abelian groups, $\pi = \pi_1 \times \pi_2$, and L be a Galois extension of the field K with $\pi_1 = Gal(L/K)$. Regard L as a π-field through the projection $\pi \to \pi_1$. Assume that*

(i) $\gcd\{|\pi_1|, |\pi_2|\} = 1$,

(ii) *$char\, K = 0$ or $char K > 0$ with $char K \nmid |\pi_2|$, and*

(iii) *$K(\zeta_m)$ is a cyclic extension of K where m is the exponent of π_2.*

If M is π-lattice such that $\rho_\pi(M)$ is an invertible π-lattice, than $L(M)^\pi$ is retract rational over K.

The reader will find that the above theorem is an adaptation of Saltman's criterion for retract rational algebraic tori [Sa3, Theorem 3.14] (see Theorem 2.5). We also formulate another criterion for retract rationality of $L(M)^\pi$ when π is a semi-direct product group (see Theorem 4.3). An amusing consequence of this criterion (when compared with Theorem 1.3) is that, if $G = A \rtimes H$ is a semi-direct product of an abelian normal subgroup A and a cyclic subgroup H, then $\mathbb{C}(G)$ is always retract rational (see Proposition 5.2).

We will organize this paper as follows. We recall some basic facts of multiplicative group actions in Section 2. In particular, the flabby class map which was mentioned in Theorem 1.13 will be defined. We will give additional tools for proving Theorem 1.9 and Theorems 1.11–1.13 in Section 3. In Section 4 Theorem 1.13 and its variants will be proved. The proof of Theorem 1.11 and Theorem 1.12 will be given in Section 5. Section 6 contains the proof of Theorem 1.9.

Acknowledgements. I am indebted to Prof. R. G. Swan for providing a simplified proof in Step 7 of Case 1 of Theorem 1.9 (see Section 6). The proof in a previous version of this paper was lengthy and complicated. I thank Swan's generosity for allowing me to include his proof in this article.

Notations and terminology. A field extension L over K is rational if L is purely transcendental over K; L is stably rational over K if there exist $y_1, \ldots, y_N$ such that $y_1, \ldots, y_N$ are algebraically independent over L and $L(y_1, \ldots, y_N)$ is rational over K. More generally, two fields L_1 and L_2 are called stably isomorphic if $L_1(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ is isomorphic to $L_2(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ where $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are algebraically independent over L_1 and L_2 respectively.

Recall the definition of $K(G)$ at the beginning of this section: $K(G) = K(x_g : g \in G)^G$. If L is a field with a finite group G acting on it, we will call it a G-field. Two G-fields L_1 and L_2 are G-isomorphic if there is an isomorphism $\varphi : L_1 \to L_2$ satisfying $\varphi(\sigma \cdot u) = \sigma \cdot \varphi(u)$ for any $\sigma \in G$, any $u \in L_1$.

We will denote by ζ_n a primitive n-th root of unity in some extension field of K when char $K = 0$ or char $K = p > 0$ with $p \nmid n$. All the groups in this article are finite groups. $\mathbb{Z}_n$ will be the cyclic group of order n or the ring of integers modulo n depending on the situation from the context. $\mathbb{Z}[\pi]$ is the group ring of a finite group π over $\mathbb{Z}$. $Z(G)$ is the center of the group G. The exponent of a group G is the least common multiple of the orders of elements in G. The representation space of the regular representation of G over K is denoted by $W = \bigoplus_{g \in G} K \cdot x(g)$ where G acts on W by $g \cdot x(h) = x(gh)$ for any $g, h \in G$.

§2. Multiplicative group actions

Let π be a finite group. A π-lattice M is a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}[\pi]$-module such that M is a free abelian group when it is regarded as an abelian group.

For any field K and a π-lattice M, $K[M]$ will denote the Laurent polynomial ring and $K(M)$ is the quotient field of $K[M]$. Explicitly, if $M = \bigoplus_{1 \le i \le m} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$ as a free abelian group, then $K[M] = K[x_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, x_m^{\pm 1}]$ and $K(M) = K(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. Since π acts on M, it will act on $K[M]$ and $K(M)$ by K-automorphisms, i.e. if $\sigma \in \pi$ and $\sigma \cdot x_j = \sum_{1 \le i \le m} a_{ij} x_i \in M$, then we define the action of σ in $K[M]$ and $K(M)$ by $\sigma \cdot x_j = \prod_{1 \le i \le m} x_i^{a_{ij}}$.

The multiplicative action of π on $K(M)$ is called a purely monomial action in [HK1]. If π is a group acting on the rational function field $K(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ by K-automorphism such that $\sigma \cdot x_j = c_j(\sigma) \cdot \prod_{1 \le i \le m} x_i^{a_{ij}}$ where $\sigma \in \pi$, $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c_j(\sigma) \in K \backslash \{0\}$, such a multiplicative group action is called a monomial action. Monomial actions arise when studying Noether's problem for non-split extension groups [Ha; Sa5].

We will introduce another kind of multiplicative actions. Let $K \subset L$ be fields and π be a finite group. Suppose that π acts on L by K-automorphisms (but it is not assumed that π acts faithfully on L). Given a π-lattice M, the action of π on L can be extended to an action of π on $L(M)$ ($= L(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ if $M = \bigoplus_{1 \le i \le m} \mathbb{Z} \cdot x_i$) by K-automorphisms defined as follows: If $\sigma \in \pi$ and $\sigma \cdot x_j = \sum_{1 \le i \le m} a_{ij} x_i \in M$, then the multiplication action in $L(M)$ is defined by $\sigma \cdot x_j = \prod_{1 \le i \le m} x_i^{a_{ij}}$ for $1 \le j \le m$.

When L is a Galois extension of K and $\pi = Gal(L/K)$ (and therefore π acts faithfully on L), the fixed subfield $L(M)^\pi$ is the function field of the algebraic torus defined over K, split by L and with character group M (see [Vo]).

We recall some basic facts of the theory of flabby (flasque) π-lattices developed by Endo and Miyata, Voskresenskii, Colliot-Thélène and Sansuc, etc. [Vo; CTS]. We refer the reader to [Sw2; Sw3; Lo] for a quick review of the theory.

In the sequel, π denotes a finite group unless otherwise specified.

Definition 2.1. A π-lattice M is called a permutation lattice if M has a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis permuted by π. M is called an invertible (or permutation projective) lattice, if it is a direct summand of some permutation lattice. A π-lattice M is called a flabby (or flasque) lattice if $H^{-1}(\pi', M) = 0$ for any subgroup π' of π. (Note that $H^{-1}(\pi', M)$ denotes the Tate cohomology group.) Similarly, M is called coflabby if $H^1(\pi', M) = 0$ for any subgroup π' of π.

It is known that an invertible π-lattice is necessarily a flabby lattice [Sw2, Lemma 8.4; Lo, Lemma 2.5.1].

Theorem 2.2. (Endo and Miyata [Sw3, Theorem 3.4; Lo, 2.10.1]) *Let π be* *a finite group. Then any flabby π-lattice is invertible if and only if all Sylow subgroups of π are cyclic.*

Denote by $\mathcal{L}_\pi$ the class of all π-lattices, and by $\mathcal{F}_\pi$ the class of all flabby π-lattices.

Definition 2.3. We define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\mathcal{F}_\pi$: Two π-lattices E_1 and E_2 are similar, denoted by $E_1 \sim E_2$, if $E_1 \oplus P$ is isomorphic to $E_2 \oplus Q$ for some permutation lattices P and Q. The similarity class containing E will be denoted by $[E]$. Define $F_\pi = \mathcal{F}_\pi / \sim$, the set of all similarity classes of flabby π-lattices.

F_π becomes a commutative monoid if we define $[E_1]+[E_2] = [E_1 \oplus E_2]$. The monoid F_π is called the flabby class monoid of π.

Definition 2.4. We define a map $\rho : \mathcal{L}_\pi \to F_\pi$ as follows. For any π-lattice M, there exists a flabby resolution, i.e. a short exact sequence of π-lattices $0 \to M \to P \to E \to 0$ where P is a permutation lattice and E is a flabby lattice [Sw2, Lemma 8.5]. We define $\rho_\pi(M) = [E] \in F_\pi$. The map $\rho_\pi : \mathcal{L}_\pi \to F_\pi$ is well-defined [Sw2, Lemma 8.7]; it is called the flabby class map. We will simply write ρ instead of ρ_π, if the group π is obvious from the context.

Theorem 2.5. (Saltman [Sa3, Theorem 3.14]) *Let L be a Galois extension of K with $\pi = Gal(L/K)$ and M be a π-lattice. Then $\rho_\pi(M)$ is invertible if and only if $L(M)^\pi$ is retract rational over K.*

§3. Generalities

We recall several results which will be used later.

Theorem 3.1. ([HK2, Theorem 1]) *Let L be a field and G be a finite group acting on $L(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, the rational function field of m variables over L. Suppose that*

(i) *for any $\sigma \in G$, $\sigma(L) \subset L$;*

(ii) *The restriction of the action of G to L is faithful;*

(iii) *for any* $\sigma \in G$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma(x_m) \end{pmatrix} = A(\sigma) \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_m \end{pmatrix} + B(\sigma)$$

where $A(\sigma) \in GL_m(L)$ *and* $B(\sigma)$ *is an* $m \times 1$ *matrix over* L.

Then $L(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = L(z_1, \ldots, z_m)$ *where* $\sigma(z_i) = z_i$ *for all* $\sigma \in G$, *and for any* $1 \le i \le m$. *In fact,* $z_1, \ldots, z_m$ *can be defined by*

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_m \end{pmatrix} = A \cdot \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_m \end{pmatrix} + B$$

for some $A \in GL_m(L)$ *and for some* B *which is an* $m \times 1$ *matrix over* L. *Moreover, if* $B(\sigma) = 0$ *for all* $\sigma \in G$, *we may choose* $B = 0$ *in defining* $z_1, \ldots, z_m$.

Theorem 3.2. (Kuniyoshi [CHK, Theorem 2.5]) *Let* K *be a field with* $\mathrm{char} K = p > 0$ *and* G *be a* p*-group. Then* $K(G)$ *is always rational over* K.

Proposition 3.3. *Let* π *be a finite group and* L *be a* π*-field. Suppose that* $0 \to M_1 \to M_2 \to N \to 0$ *is a short exact sequence of* π*-lattices satisfying* (i) π *acts faithfully on* $L(M_1)$, *and* (ii) N *is an invertible* π*-lattice. Then the* π*-fields* $L(M_2)$ *and* $L(M_1 \oplus N)$ *are* π*-isomorphic.*

Proof. We follow the proof of [Le, Proposition 1.5]. Denote $L(M_1)^\times = L(M_1)\backslash\{0\}$. Consider the exact sequence of π-modules:

$$0 \to L(M_1)^\times \to L(M_1)^\times \cdot M_2 \to N \to 0.$$

By Hilbert Theorem 90, we find that $H^1(\pi', L(M_1)^\times) = 0$ for any subgroup $\pi' \subset \pi$. Applying [Le, Proposition 1.2] we find that the above exact sequence splits. The resulting π-morphism $N \to L(M_1)^\times \cdot M_2$ provides the required π-isomorphism form $L(M_2)$ to $L(M_1 \oplus N)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Let the assumptions be the same as in Proposition 3.3. Assume furthermore that N is a permutation π-lattice. Then $L(M_2)^\pi$ is rational over $L(M_1)^\pi$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.3, $L(M_2) = L(M_1)(N)$. Since π acts faithfully on $L(M_1)$, we may apply Theorem 3.1 and find $u_1, \ldots, u_n \in L(M_2)$ such that $L(M_2) = L(M_1)(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ with $\sigma(u_i) = u_i$ for any $\sigma \in \pi$, any $1 \le i \le n$ where $n = \operatorname{rank}(N)$. Hence $L(M_2)^\pi = L(M_1)^\pi(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Let π be a finite abelian group of exponent e and K be a field such that char $K = 0$ or char$K > 0$ with char$K \nmid e$. If P is a permutation π-lattice, then $K(P)^\pi = K(\zeta_e)(M)^{\pi_0}$ where $\pi_0 = Gal(K(\zeta_e)/K)$ and M is some π_0-lattice.*

Proof. We follow the standard approach to solving Noether's problem for abelian groups [Sw1; Sw2; Le].

Note that $K(P)^\pi = \{K(\zeta_e)(P)^{\langle\pi_0\rangle}\}^{\langle\pi\rangle} = K(\zeta_e)(P)^{\langle\pi,\pi_0\rangle}$ where the action of π is extended to $K(\zeta_e)(P)$ by defining $g(\zeta_e) = \zeta_e$ for any $g \in \pi$, and the action of π_0 is extended to $K(\zeta_e)(P)$ by requiring that π_0 acts trivially on P.

Since π is abelian of exponent e, we may diagonalize its action on P, i.e. we may find $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in K(\zeta_e)(P)$ such that $n = \operatorname{rank}(P)$, $g(x_i)/x_i \in \langle\zeta_e\rangle$ for any $g \in \pi$, and $K(\zeta_e)(P) = K(\zeta_e)(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Thus $K(\zeta_e)(P)^{\langle\pi\rangle} = K(\zeta_e)(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ where $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are monomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Let M be the multiplicative subgroup generated by $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ in $K(\zeta_e)(y_1, \ldots, y_n)\backslash\{0\}$. Then M is a π_0-lattice and $K(\zeta_e)(y_1, \ldots, y_n)^{\pi_0} = K(\zeta_e)(M)^{\pi_0}$. $\square$

Proposition 3.6. *Let π and K be the same as in Lemma 3.5. If $K(\zeta_e)$ is a cyclic extension of K, then $K(\pi)$ is retract rational over K.*

Proof. We may regard the regular representation of π is given by a permutation π-lattice. Thus $K(\pi) = K(\zeta_e)(M)^{\pi_0}$ where $\pi_0 = Gal(K(\zeta_e)/K)$. Since π_0 is assumed cyclic, thus we may apply Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.5. ☐

§4. Proof of Theorem 1.13

Lemma 4.1. *Let π be a finite group, M be a π-lattice. Suppose that π_0 is a normal subgroup of π and π_0 acts trivially on M. Thus we may regard M as a lattice over π/π_0.*

(1) *M is a permutation π-lattice $\Leftrightarrow$ So is it as a π/π_0-lattice.*

(2) *M is an invertible π-lattice $\Leftrightarrow$ So is it as a π/π_0-lattice.*

(3) *M is a flabby π-lattice $\Leftrightarrow$ So is it as a π/π_0-lattice.*

(4) *If $0 \to M \to P \to E \to 0$ is a flabby resolution of M as a π/π_0-lattice, this short exact sequence is also a flabby resolution of M as a π-lattice.*

(5) *$\rho_\pi(M)$ is an invertible π-lattice $\Leftrightarrow$ $\rho_{\pi/\pi_0}(M)$ is an invertible π/π_0-lattice.*

Proof. The properties (1)–(4) can be found in [CTS, Lemma 2, p.179–180]. As to (5), the direction "$\Leftarrow$" is obvious by applying (4). For the other direction, assume $\rho_\pi(M)$ is an invertible π-lattice. Let $0 \to M \to P \to E \to 0$ be a flabby resolution of M as a π-lattice. Then $0 \to M^{\pi_0} \to P^{\pi_0} \to E^{\pi_0} \to 0$ is a flabby resolution of $M = M^{\pi_0}$ in the category of π/π_0-lattices by [CTS, Lemma (xi), p.180]. It remains to show that E^{π_0} is invertible. Since $[E] = \rho_\pi(M)$ is invertible, we can find a π-lattice N such that $E \oplus N = N'$ is a permutation π-lattice. Note that N'^{π_0} is a permutation π/π_0-lattice by [CTS, Lemma 2(i), p.180]. We find that E^{π_0} is invertible because $E^{\pi_0} \oplus N^{\pi_0} = (E \oplus N)^{\pi_0} = N'^{\pi_0}$. ☐

Lemma 4.2. *Let the assumptions be the same as in Theorem 1.13. If P is a permutation π-lattice, then $L(P)^\pi$ is retract rational over K.*

Proof. Since π_1 and π_2 are abelian groups with $\gcd\{|\pi_1|, |\pi_2|\} = 1$, every subgroup π' of π can be written as $\pi' = \rho \times \lambda$ where ρ is a subgroup of π_1 and λ is a subgroup of π_2.

As a permutation π-lattice, we may write $P = \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}[\pi/\pi^{(i)}]$ where $\pi^{(i)}$ is a subgroup of π. Write $\pi^{(i)} = \rho_i \times \lambda_i$ where $\rho_i \subset \pi_1$, $\lambda_i \subset \pi_2$. Hence $\mathbb{Z}[\pi/\pi^{(i)}] = \mathbb{Z}[\pi/(\rho_i \times \lambda_i)] = \mathbb{Z}[(\pi_1/\rho_i) \times (\pi_2/\lambda_i)]$.

It is not difficult to see that $\mathbb{Z}[\pi/\pi^{(i)}] = \bigoplus \mathbb{Z} \cdot u_{kl}^{(i)}$ where $1 \le k \le t = |\pi_1/\rho_i|$, $1 \le l \le r = |\pi_2/\lambda_i|$. Moreover, if $g \in \pi_1$ and $g' \in \pi_2$, then $g \cdot u_{kl}^{(i)} = u_{g(k),l}^{(i)}$, $g' \cdot u_{kl}^{(i)} = u_{k,g'(l)}^{(i)}$ and the homomorphisms $\pi_1 \to S_t$ and $\pi_2 \to S_r$ are induced from the permutation representations associated to $\pi/\pi^{(i)} = (\pi_1/\rho_i) \times (\pi_2/\lambda_i)$ where S_t and S_r are the symmetric groups of degree t and r respectively.

Since π_1 is faithful on L, we may apply Theorem 3.1. Explicitly, for any $1 \le l \le r$, we may find $A^{(i)} \in GL_t(L)$ and define $v_{kl}^{(i)}$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_{1,l}^{(i)} \\ v_{2,l}^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ v_{t,l}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} = A^{(i)} \begin{pmatrix} u_{1,l}^{(1)} \\ u_{2,l}^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ u_{t,l}^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} \tag{1}$$

such that $g \cdot v_{k,l}^{(i)} = v_{k,l}^{(i)}$ for any $g \in \pi_1$, and $L(\mathbb{Z}[\pi/\pi^{(i)}]) = L(u_{kl}^{(i)} : 1 \le k \le t,\ 1 \le l \le r$. If $g' \in \pi_2$, from the relation $g' \cdot u_{kl}^{(i)} = u_{k,g'(l)}^{(i)}$ and Formula (1), we find that $g' \cdot v_{kl}^{(i)} = v_{k,g'(l)}^{(i)}$.

Since $L(P)^{\pi_1} = L(u_{kl}^{(i)})^{\pi_1} = L(v_{kl}^{(i)})^{\pi_1} = K(v_{kl}^{(i)})$ where i, k, l runs over index sets which are understood, it follows that $L(P)^{\pi} = K(v_{kl}^{(i)})^{\pi_2}$. Note that π_2 acts on $\{v_{kl}^{(i)}\}$ by permutations.

By Lemma 3.5 $K(v_{kl}^{(i)})^{\pi_2} = K(\zeta_m)(M)^{\pi_0}$ where m is the exponent of π_2, $\pi_0 = Gal(K(\zeta_m)/K)$ and M is some π_0-lattice.

By our assumption, π_0 is a cyclic group. Hence $\rho_{\pi_0}(M)$ is invertible by Theorem 2.2. Apply Theorem 2.5. We find that $K(\zeta_m)(M)^{\pi_0}$ is retract rational over K. □

Proof of Theorem 1.13 ————————————

Step 1. Suppose that M is a π-lattice such that $\rho_\pi(M)$ is invertible.

Define $\pi_0 = \{g \in \pi_2 : g \text{ acts trivially on } L(M)\}$. Then π/π_0 acts faithfully on $L(M)$. Moreover, $\rho_{\pi/\pi_0}(M)$ is invertible by Lemma 4.1.

In other words, without loss of generality we may assume that π is faithfully on $L(M)$. Thus we will keep in force this assumption in the sequel.

Step 2. Since $\rho_\pi(M)$ is invertible, by [Sa3, Theorem 2.3, p.176], we may find π-lattice M', P, Q such that P and Q are permutation lattices, $0 \to M \to M' \to Q \to 0$ is exact, and the inclusion map $M \to M'$ factors through P, i.e. the following diagram commutes

(2)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M \arrow[dd, "1_M"'] \arrow[dr] & & & & \\
 & & P \arrow[dr] & & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & M \arrow[rr] & & M' \arrow[r] & Q \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The remaining proof proceeds quite similar to that of [Sa3, Theorem 3.14, p.189].

Step 3. We get a commutative diagram of K-algebra morphisms from the diagram in (2), i.e.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
L[M]^\pi \arrow[dd, "1"'] \arrow[dr] & & & \\
 & L[P]^\pi \arrow[dr] & & \\
L[M]^\pi \arrow[rr] & & L[M']^\pi \arrow[r] & L[Q]^\pi
\end{tikzcd}$$

Step 4. The quotient field of $L[P]^\pi$ is $L(P)^\pi$, which is retract rational over K by Lemma 4.2. Thus the identity map $1 : L[P]^\pi \to L[P]^\pi$ factors rationally by [Sa3, Lemma 3.5], i.e. there is a localized polynomial ring $K[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f]$ and K-algebra maps $\varphi : L[P]^\pi \to K[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f]$, $\psi : K[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f] \to L[P]^\pi$ such that $\psi \circ \varphi = 1$.

It follows that the composite map $g : L[M]^\pi \to L[P]^\pi \to L[M']^\pi$ also factors rationally, i.e. there are K-algebra $\varphi' : L[M]^\pi \to K[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f]$, $\psi' : K[x_1, \ldots, x_n][1/f] \to L[M']^\pi$ such that $g = \psi' \circ \varphi'$.

Step 5. By Lemma 3.4 $L(M')^\pi$ is rational over $L(M)^\pi$. (This is the only one step we use the assumption that π is faithful on $L(M)$.)

Now we may apply [Sa3, Proposition 3.6(b), p.183] where, in the notation of [Sa3], we take $S = T = L[M]^\pi$, φ is the identity map on $L(M)^\pi$. We conclude that $1 : L[M]^\pi \to L[M]^\pi$ factors rationally, i.e. $L(M)^\pi$ is retract rational over K. $\square$

Here is a variant of Theorem 1.13.

Theorem 4.3. *Let π be a finite group, $0 \to \pi_1 \to \pi \to \pi_2 \to 1$ is a group extension, and L be a Galois extension of the field K with $\pi_2 = Gal(L/K)$. Let π act on L through the projection $\pi \to \pi_2$. Assume that*

(i) *π_1 is an abelian group of exponent e with $\zeta_e \in L$,*

(ii) *the extension $0 \to \pi_1 \to \pi \to \pi_2 \to 1$ splits, and*

(iii) *every Sylow subgroup of π_2 is cyclic.*

If M is a π-lattice such that $\rho_\pi(M)$ is an invertible lattice, then $L(M)^\pi$ is retract rational over K.

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of Theorem 1.13.

We claim that $L(P)^\pi$ is retract rational for any permutation π-lattice P.

For the proof, we will use [Sa5, Theorem 2.1, p.546]. We will show that (c) of [Sa5, Theorem 2.1] is valid, which will guarantee that $L(P)^\pi$ is retract rational. By assumption (iii), part (d) of [Sa5, Theorem 2.1] is valid by Theorem 2.2. It remains to check that the embedding problem of L/K and the extension $0 \to \pi_1 \to \pi \to \pi_2 \to 1$ is solvable. But this is the well-known split embedding problem [ILF, Theorem 1.9, p.12].

Now define $\pi_0 = \{g \in \pi : g \text{ acts trivially on } L(M)\}$. Note that $\pi_0 \subset \pi_1$. The remaining proof is the same as in the proof of Theorem 1.13 and is omitted. $\square$

Corollary 4.4. *Let π be an abelian group of exponent e, K be a field with $\zeta_e \in K$. Suppose that M is a π-lattice and π acts on $K(M)$ by K-automorphisms. If $\rho_\pi(M)$ is an invertible module, than $K(M)^\pi$ is retract rational over K.*

§5. Proof of Theorems 1.11 and 1.12

Proof of Theorem 1.12 ——————————-

Step 1. Write $G = A \rtimes G_0$ where $G_0 =< \sigma >$ is a cyclic group of order m, and $A = A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_r$ with each $A_i =< \rho_i >$ being a cyclic group of order e_i, $e = e_1$ and $e_r \mid e_{r-1},\ \cdots, e_2 \mid e_1$.

Define $B_i =< \rho_i, \cdots, \hat{\rho}_i, \cdots, \rho_r >$ to be the subgroup of A by deleting the i-th direct factor.

Let $Gal(K(\zeta_e)/K) =< \tau >$ be a cyclic group of order n. Write $\zeta = \zeta_e$ and $\tau \cdot \zeta = \zeta^a$ for some integer a.

For $1 \le i \le r$, choose $\zeta_i \in< \zeta >$ such that ζ_i is a primitive e_i-th root of unity. Note that $\tau \cdot \zeta_i = \zeta_i^a$.

Let $n_i = [K(\zeta_i) : K]$ for $1 \le i \le r$. Note that $n = n_1$.

Step 2. Let $W = \bigoplus_{g \in G} K \cdot x(g)$ be the representation space of the regular representation of G. Then

$$K(G) = K(W)^G = \{K(\zeta)(W)^{<\tau>}\}^G = K(\zeta)(W)^{<G,\tau>}$$

where the action of G and τ are extended to $K(\zeta)(W)$ by requiring that G and τ act trivially on $K(\zeta)$ and W respectively.

Step 3. For $1 \le i \le r$, define

$$u_i = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}_{e_i},\ g \in B_i} \zeta_i^l \cdot x(\rho_i^l \cdot g).$$

Note that $\rho_i \cdot u_i = \zeta_i^{-1} u_i$ and, if $j \ne i$, then $\rho_i \cdot u_i = u_i$.

For $1 \le i \le r$, write χ_i to be the character $\chi_i : A \longrightarrow K(\zeta)^\times$ such that $g \cdot u_i = \chi_i(g) \cdot u_i$. Since $\chi_1, \cdots, \chi_r$ are distinct characters on A, it follows that $u_1, \cdots, u_r$ are linearly independent vectors in $K(\zeta) \otimes_K W$.

Moreover, the subgroup A acts faithfully on $\bigoplus_{1\leq i\leq r} K(\zeta)u_i$.

Step 4. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}$, define

$$v_{ij} = \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}_{e_i},\ g\in B_i} \zeta_i^{la^j} \cdot x(\rho_i^l \cdot g).$$

Thus we have elements $v_{1,1}, \cdots, v_{1,n_1}, v_{2,1}, \cdots, v_{2,n_2}, \cdots, v_{r,n_r}$; in total we have $n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_r$ such elements.

As in Step 3, these elements v_{ij} are linearly independent. Note that $\tau \cdot v_{ij} = v_{i,j+1}$.

Step 5. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_m$. define

$$x_{i,j,k} = \sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}_{e_i},\ g\in B_i} \zeta_i^{la^j} \cdot x(\sigma^k \cdot \rho_i^l \cdot g).$$

We have in total $m(n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_r)$ such elements $x_{i,j,k}$.

Note that $x_{i,j,0} = v_{ij}$, and the vector $x_{i,j,k}$ is just a "translation" of the vector $x_{i,j,0}$ in the space $\bigoplus_{g\in G} K(\zeta)x(g)$ (with basis $x(g),\ g \in G$). Thus these vectors $x_{i,j,k}$ are linearly independent. Note that $\sigma \cdot v_{i,j,k} = v_{i,j,k+1}$. Moreover, the group $< G, \tau >$ acts faithfully on $\bigoplus K(\xi) \cdot x_{i,j,k}$.

Apply Theorem 3.1. We find $K(G) = K(\zeta)(x_{ijk} :\ 1 \leq i \leq r,\ j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_m)(w_1, \cdots, w_s)$ where $s = |G| - m(n_1 + n_2 + \cdots + n_r)$, and $\lambda(w_i) = w_i$ for any i, any $\lambda \in< G, \tau >$.

Step 6. We will consider the fixed field $K(\zeta)(x_{ijk} : 1 \leq i \leq r,\ j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_m)^{<G,\tau>}$.

Let $\pi =< \sigma, \tau >$, $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[\pi]$. Let $N =< x_{ijk} : 1 \leq i \leq r,\ j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_m >$ be the multiplicative subgroup generated by these x_{ijk} in $K(\zeta)(x_{ijk} : 1 \leq i \leq r,\ j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_m) \setminus \{0\}$. Note that N is a Λ-module. In fact, N is a permutation π-lattice.

Define

$$\Phi : N \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_r}$$

by $\Phi(x) = (\bar{l}_1, \bar{l}_2, \cdots, \bar{l}_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{n_r}$, if $x = \prod x_{ijk}^{b_{ijk}}$ (with $b_{ijk} \in \mathbb{Z}$) and $\rho_1(x) = \zeta_1^{l_1} x$, $\rho_2(x) = \zeta_2^{l_2} x$, $\cdots$, $\rho_r(x) = \zeta_r^{l_r} x$.

Define $M = \mathrm{Ker}(\Phi)$. We find that $K(\zeta)(x_{ijk} : 1 \le i \le r, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_m)^A = K(\zeta)(M)$. Thus it remains to find $K(\zeta)(M)^\pi$. Note that M is a π-lattice.

Step 7. Since $gcd\{m,\ n\} = 1$, it follows that π is a cyclic group. Hence $\rho_\pi(M)$ is invertible by Theorem 2.2.

Apply Theorem 1.13. We find that $K(\zeta)(M)^\pi$ is retract rational over K. Since $K(G)$ is rational over $K(\zeta)(M)^\pi$, it follows that $K(G)$ is also retract rational over K by [Sa3, Proposition 3.6(a), p.183]. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.11 ————————————-

If $char K = p$, apply Theorem 3.2. Thus $K(G)$ is rational. In particular it is retract rational.

¿From now on we will assume that $char K \neq p$. It is not difficult to verify that all the assumptions of Theorem 1.12 are valid in the present situation. Hence the result. $\square$

Corollary 5.1. *Let K be a field, p be any prime number, $G = A \rtimes G_0$ be a semi-direct product of p-groups where A is a normal abelian subgroup of exponent p^e and G_0 is a cyclic group of order p^m. If $char K \neq p$, assume that* (i) *both $K(\zeta_{p^e})$ and $K(\zeta_{p^m})$ are cyclic extensions of K and* (ii) *$p \nmid [K(\zeta_{p^e}) : K]$. Then $K(G)$ is retract rational over K.*

Proposition 5.2. *Let K be a field and $G = A \rtimes G_0$ be a semi-direct product. Assume that*

(i) *A is an abelian normal subgroup of exponent e in G and G_0 is a cyclic group of order m.*

(ii) *either $char K = 0$ or $char K > 0$ with $char K \nmid em$, and*

(iii) *$\zeta_e \in K$ and $K(\zeta_m)$ is a cyclic extension of K.*

If $G \longrightarrow GL(V)$ is a finite-dimensional linear representation of G over K, then $K(V)^G$ is retract rational over K.

Proof. Decompose V into $V = \bigoplus V_\chi$ where $\chi : A \longrightarrow K \setminus \{0\}$ runs over linear characters of A and $V_\chi = \{v \in V : \; g \cdot v = \chi(g) \cdot v \;$ for all $\; g \in A\}$

It is easy to see that $\sigma(V_\chi) = V_{\chi'}$ for some χ'. Suppose $V_{\chi_1}, V_{\chi_2}, \cdots, V_{\chi_s}$ is an orbit of σ, i.e. $\sigma(V_{\chi_j}) = V_{\chi_{j+1}}$ and $\sigma(V_{\chi_s}) = V_{\chi_1}$. Choose a basis $v_1, \cdots, v_t$ of V_{χ_1}. It follows that $\{\sigma^j(v_i) : \; 1 \le i \le t, \; 0 \le j \le s-1\}$ is a basis of $\oplus_{1 \le j \le s} V_{\chi_j}$.

In this way, we may find a basis $w_1, \cdots, w_n$ in V such that (i) for any $g \in A$, any $1 \le i \le r, \;\; g \cdot w_i = \alpha w_i$ for some $\alpha \in K$; and (ii) $\sigma \cdot w_i = w_j$ for some j.

It follows that $K(V)^A = K(w_1, \cdots, w_n)^A = K(u_1, \cdots, u_n)$ where $u_1, \cdots, u_n$ are monomials in $w_1, \cdots, w_n$. Thus $K(u_1, \cdots, u_n) = K(M)$ for some G_0-lattice M. It follows that $K(V)^G = \{K(V)^A\}^{G_0} = K(M)^{<\sigma>}$.

By Theorem 2.2, $\rho_{G_0}(M)$ is invertible. Apply Theorem 1.12. $\square$

Remark. In the above theorem it is essential that G is a is a split extension group. For non-split extension groups, monomial actions (instead of merely purely monomial actions) may arise; see the proof of Theorem 1.3 [Ha] and also [Sa5].

§6. Proof of Theorem 1.9

We will prove Theorem 1.9 in this section.

If $char K = p$, apply Theorem 3.2. We find that $K(G)$ is rational. In particular, it is retract rational.

Thus we will assume that $char K \neq p$ from now on till the end of this section.

If $\zeta_p \in K$, we apply Theorem 1.4 to find that $K(G)$ is rational. Hence we will consider only the situation $[K(\zeta_p) : K] = 2$ in the sequel.

Since p be an odd prime number, there is only one non-abelian p-group of order p^3 with exponent p, and there are precisely two non-isomorphic non-abelian p-groups of order p^4 with exponent p (see [CK, Section 2 and Section 3]). We will solve the rationality problem of these three groups separately.

Let $\zeta = \zeta_p$, $\mathrm{Gal}(K(\zeta)/K) = \langle \tau \rangle$ with $\tau \cdot \zeta = \zeta^{-1}$.

Case 1. $G = \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3 : \sigma_i^p = 1,\ \sigma_1 \in Z(G),\ \sigma_2\sigma_3 = \sigma_3\sigma_1\sigma_2 \rangle$.

Step 1. Let $W = \bigoplus_{g \in G} K \cdot x(g)$ be the representation space of the regular representation of G. Note that

$$K(G) = K(x(g) : g \in G)^G = \{K(\zeta)(x(g) : g \in G)^{\langle \tau \rangle}\}^G = K(\zeta)(x(g) : g \in G)^{\langle G, \tau \rangle}.$$

Step 2. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, define $x_{0,i}, x_{1,i} \in \bigoplus_{g \in G} K(\zeta) \cdot x(g)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{0,i} &= \sum_{j,k \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{-j-k} x(\sigma_3^i \sigma_1^j \sigma_2^k), \\ x_{1,i} &= \sum_{j,k \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{j+k} \cdot x(\sigma_3^i \sigma_1^j \sigma_2^k). \end{aligned}$$

We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 &: \ x_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-1} x_{1,i}, \\ \sigma_2 &: \ x_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta^{i+1} x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-i-1} x_{1,i}, \\ \sigma_3 &: \ x_{0,i} \mapsto x_{0,i+1},\ x_{1,i} \mapsto x_{1,i+1}, \\ \tau &: \ x_{0,i} \leftrightarrow x_{1,i}. \end{aligned}$$

The restriction of the action of $\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle$ to $K(\zeta) \cdot x_{0,i}$ and $K(\zeta) \cdot x_{1,i}$ is given by distinct characters of $\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \rangle$ to $K(\zeta) \setminus \{0\}$. Hence $x_{0,0}, x_{0,1}, x_{0,2}, \ldots, x_{0,p-1}, x_{1,0}, \ldots, x_{1,p-1}$ are linearly independent vectors. Moreover, the action of $\langle G, \tau \rangle$ on $K(\zeta)(x_{0,i}, x_{1,i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_p)$ is faithful.

By Theorem 3.1 $K(\zeta)(x(g) : g \in G) = K(\zeta)(x_{0,i}, x_{1,i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_p)(X_1, \ldots, X_l)$ where $l = p^3 - 2p$ and $\rho(X_j) = X_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq l$, any $\rho \in \langle G, \tau \rangle$.

Step 3. Define $x_0 = x_{0,0}^p$, $y_0 = x_{0,0}x_{1,0}$ and $x_i = x_{0,i} \cdot x_{0,i-1}^{-1}$, $y_i = y_{0,i} \cdot y_{0,i-1}^{-1}$ for $1 \le i \le p-1$. It follows that $K(\zeta)(x_{0,i}, x_{1,i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_p)^{\langle \sigma_1 \rangle} = K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_p)$. Moreover, the actions of σ_2, σ_3, τ are given as

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_2 :\ & x_0 \mapsto x_0,\ y_0 \mapsto y_0,\ x_i \mapsto \zeta x_i,\ y_i \mapsto \zeta^{-1} y_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le p-1, \\
\sigma_3 :\ & x_0 \mapsto x_0 x_1^p,\ x_1 \mapsto x_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto x_{p-1} \mapsto (x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{p-1})^{-1}, \\
& y_0 \mapsto y_0 y_1 x_1,\ y_1 \mapsto y_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto y_{p-1} \mapsto (y_1 y_2 \cdots y_{p-1})^{-1}, \\
\tau :\ & x_0 \mapsto y_0^p x_0^{-1},\ y_0 \mapsto y_0,\ x_i \leftrightarrow y_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le p-1.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 4. Define $X = x_0 y_0^{-(p-1)/2}$, $Y = x_0^{-1} y_0^{(p+1)/2}$.

Then $K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_p) = K(\zeta)(X, Y, x_i, y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)$ and $\sigma_2(X) = X$, $\sigma_2(Y) = Y$, $\sigma_3(X) = \alpha X$, $\sigma_3(Y) = \beta Y$, $\tau : X \leftrightarrow Y$ where $\alpha, \beta \in K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1) \backslash \{0\}$.

Apply Theorem 3.1. We may find $\widetilde{X}$, $\widetilde{Y}$ so that $K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_p) = K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{Y})$ with $\rho(\widetilde{X}) = \widetilde{X}$, $\rho(\widetilde{Y}) = \widetilde{Y}$ for any $\rho \in \langle \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \tau \rangle$. Thus it remains to consider $K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \tau \rangle}$.

Step 5. Define $u_0 = x_1^p$, $v_0 = x_1 y_1$, $u_i = x_{i+1} x_i^{-1}$, $v_i = y_{i+1} y_i^{-1}$ for $1 \le i \le p-2$.

It follows that $K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle} = K(\zeta)(u_i, v_i : 0 \le i \le p-2)$. The actions of σ_3 and τ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_3 :\ & u_0 \mapsto u_0 u_1^p,\ v_0 \mapsto v_0 v_1 u_1,\ u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_{p-2} \mapsto (u_0 u_1^{p-1} u_2^{p-2} \cdots u_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\
& v_1 \mapsto v_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto v_{p-2} \mapsto u_0 (v_0^p v_1^{p-1} \cdots v_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\
\tau :\ & u_0 \mapsto u_0^{-1} v_0^p,\ v_0 \mapsto v_0,\ u_i \leftrightarrow v_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le p-2.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 6. Define $u_{p-1} = (u_0 u_1^{p-1} u_2^{p-2} \cdots u_{p-2}^2)^{-1}$, $w_i = v_0 v_1 \cdots v_i u_1 u_2 \cdots u_i$ for $1 \le i \le p-2$, and $w_{p-1} = (v_0^{p-1} v_1^{p-2} \cdots v_{p-2} u_1^{p-2} u_2^{p-3} \cdots u_{p-2})^{-1}$. We find that $K(u_i, v_i : 0 \le$

$i \leq p-2) = K(u_i, w_i : 1 \leq i \leq p-1)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_3 :\ & u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_{p-1} \mapsto (u_1 u_2 \cdots u_{p-1})^{-1}, \\ & w_1 \mapsto w_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto w_{p-1} \mapsto (w_1 w_2 \cdots w_{p-1})^{-1}, \\ \tau :\ & u_i \mapsto w_i (u_i w_{i-1})^{-1},\ w_i \mapsto w_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \leq i \leq p-1. \end{aligned}$$

where we write $w_0 = v_0$ for convenience. (Granting that w_0 is defined as above, we have a relation $w_0 w_1 \cdots w_{p-1} = 1$. But we don't have the relation $u_0 u_1 \cdots u_{p-1} = 1$ because we define $u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{p-2}$ first and u_{p-1} is defined by another way.)

We will study whether $K(\zeta)(u_i, w_i : 1 \leq i \leq p-1)^{\langle \sigma_3, \tau \rangle}$ is rational or not.

Step 7. The multiplicative action in Step 6 can be formulated in terms of π-lattices where $\pi = \langle \tau, \sigma_3 \rangle$ as follows.

Let $M = (\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} \mathbb{Z} \cdot u_i) \oplus (\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} \mathbb{Z} \cdot w_i)$ and define $w_0 = -w_1 - w_2 - \cdots - w_{p-1}$. Define a $\mathbb{Z}[\pi]$-module structure on M by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_3 :\ & u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_{p-1} \mapsto -u_1 - u_2 - \cdots - u_{p-1}, \\ & w_1 \mapsto w_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto w_{p-1} \mapsto -w_1 - w_2 - \cdots - w_{p-1}, \\ \tau :\ & u_i \mapsto -u_i + w_i - w_{i-1},\ w_i \mapsto w_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \leq i \leq p-1. \end{aligned}$$

.

We claim that $M \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\pi_1] \bigotimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\pi_2]/\Phi_p(\sigma_3)$ with $\pi_1 = \langle \tau \rangle$, $\pi_2 = \langle \sigma_3 \rangle$.

Throughout this step, we will write $\sigma = \sigma_3$ and $\pi = < \sigma,\ \tau >$. Define $\rho = \sigma\tau$. Then ρ is a generator of π with order $2p$ where p is an odd prime number.

Let $\Phi_p(T) \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ be the p-th cyclotomic polynomial. Note that $\Phi_p(\sigma)(u_i) = \Phi_p(\sigma)(w_i) = 0$. It follows that $\Phi_p(\sigma) \cdot M = 0$.

Since $\Phi_p(\sigma^2) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq p-1} \sigma^i = \Phi_p(\sigma)$, we know that $\Phi_p(\sigma^2) \cdot M = 0$. From $\rho^2 = \sigma^2$, we find that $\Phi_p(\rho^2) \cdot M = 0$. It is well-known that $\Phi_p(T^2) = \Phi_p(T)\Phi_{2p}(T)$ (see [Ka1, Theorem 1.1] for example). We conclude that $\Phi_p(\rho)\Phi_{2p}(\rho) \cdot M = 0$. In other words, we may regard M as a module over $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[\pi]/ < \Phi_p(\rho)\Phi_{2p}(\rho) >$.

Clearly Λ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}[\pi_1] \bigotimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\pi_2]/\Phi_p(\sigma)$ where $\pi_1 = \langle \tau \rangle$, $\pi_2 = \langle \sigma \rangle$.

It remains to show that M is isomorphic to Λ as a Λ-module.

It is not difficult to verify that $\Phi_{2p}(\rho)(u_1) = f(\rho)(w_1)$ where $f(T) = \Phi_{2p}(T) - T^{p-1}$. Define $v = u_1 - w_1$. We find that $\Phi_{2p}(\rho)(v) = -w_0$.

Since M is a Λ-module generated by u_1 and w_0, it follows that, as a Λ-module, $M =< u_1, w_0 >=< u_1 - \sigma w_0, w_0 > =< u_1 - w_1, w_0 >=< v, w_0 > =< v, w_0 + \Phi_{2p}(\rho)(v) >=< v, w_0 - w_0 >=< v >$, i.e. M is a cyclic Λ-module generated by v. Thus we get an epimorphism $\Lambda \to M$, which is an isomorphism by counting the $\mathbb{Z}$-ranks of both sides. Hence the result.

Step 8. By Step 7, $M \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\pi_1] \bigotimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\pi_2]/\Phi_p(\sigma_3)$ where $\pi_1 = \langle \tau \rangle$, $\pi_2 = \langle \sigma_3 \rangle$.

Thus we may choose a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_{p-1}$, $Z_1, \ldots, Z_{p-1}$ for M such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_3 : \ & Y_1 \mapsto Y_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto Y_{p-1} \mapsto -Y_1 - \cdots - Y_{p-1}, \\ & Z_1 \mapsto Z_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto Z_{p-1} \mapsto -Z_1 - \cdots - Z_{p-1}, \\ \tau : \ & Y_i \leftrightarrow Z_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le p-1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $K(\zeta)(M) = K(\zeta)(Y_i, Z_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)$. We emphasize that σ_3 acts on Y_i, Z_i by multiplicative actions on the field $K(\zeta)(M)$ and $\sigma_3 \cdot \zeta = \zeta$, $\tau \cdot \zeta = \zeta^{-1}$.

Step 9. In the field $K(\zeta)(M)$, define

$$s_0 = 1 + Y_1 + Y_1Y_2 + Y_1Y_2Y_3 + \cdots + Y_1Y_2\cdots Y_{p-1},$$

$$t_0 = 1 + Z_1 + Z_1Z_2 + \cdots + Z_1Z_2\cdots Z_{p-1},$$

$$s_1 = (1/s_0) - (1/p),\ s_2 = (Y_1/s_0) - (1/p),\ \ldots,\ s_{p-1} = (Y_1Y_2\cdots Y_{p-2}/s_0) - (1/p),$$

$$t_1 = (1/t_0) - (1/p),\ t_1 = (Z_1/t_0) - (1/p),\ \ldots,\ t_{p-1} = (Z_1Z_2\cdots Z_{p-2}/t_0) - (1/p).$$

It is easy to verify that $K(\zeta)(M) = K(\zeta)(s_i, t_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)$ and

$$\sigma_3 : \ s_1 \mapsto s_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto s_{p-1} \mapsto -s_1 - s_2 - \cdots - s_{p-1},$$

$$\begin{aligned} & t_1 \mapsto t_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto t_{p-1} \mapsto -t_1 - t_2 - \cdots - t_{p-1}, \\ \tau :\ & s_i \leftrightarrow t_i. \end{aligned}$$

Step 10. Define $r_i = s_i + t_i$ for $1 \le i \le p-1$. Then $K(\zeta)(s_i, t_i : 1 \le i \le p-1) = K(\zeta)(s_i, r_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_3 :\ & r_1 \mapsto r_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto r_{p-1} \mapsto -r_1 - r_2 - \cdots - r_{p-1}, \\ \tau :\ & r_i \mapsto r_i,\ s_i \mapsto -s_i + r_i. \end{aligned}$$

Apply Theorem 3.1. We find that $K(\zeta)(s_i, r_i : 1 \le i \le p-1) = K(\zeta)(r_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)(A_1, \ldots, A_{p-1})$ for some $A_1, \ldots, A_{p-1}$ with $\sigma_3(A_i) = \tau(A_i) = A_i$ for $1 \le i \le p-1$.

Thus $K(\zeta)(r_i, s_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \tau \rangle} = K(\zeta)(r_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \tau \rangle}(A_1, \ldots, A_{p-1}) = K(r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1}, A_1, \ldots, A_{p-1})$.

It remains to find $K(r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1})^{\langle \sigma_3 \rangle}$.

Step 11. Write $\pi_2 = \langle \sigma_3 \rangle$. The π_2-fields $K(r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1}, A_1)$ and $K(B_0, B_1, \ldots, B_{p-1})$ are π_2-isomorphic where $\sigma_3 : B_0 \mapsto B_1 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto B_{p-1} \mapsto B_0$. For, we may define $B = B_0 + B_1 + \cdots + B_{p-1}$ and $C_i = B_i - (B/p)$ for $0 \le i \le p-1$.

In other words $K(r_1, \ldots, r_{p-1}, A_1, \ldots, A_{p-1})^{\langle \sigma_3 \rangle} = K(B_0, B_1, \ldots, B_{p-1})^{\langle \sigma_3 \rangle}(A_2, \ldots, A_{p-1}) = K(\mathbb{Z}_p)(A_2, \ldots, A_{p-1})$.

By Lemma 3.5, $K(\mathbb{Z}_p) = K(\zeta)(N)^{\pi_1}$ where $\zeta = \zeta_p$, $\pi_1 = \mathrm{Gal}(K(\zeta)/K) = \langle \tau \rangle$ with $\tau \cdot \zeta = \zeta^{-1}$, and N is some π_1-lattice.

By Reiner's Theorem [Re], the π_1-lattice N is a direct sum of lattices of three types: (1) $\tau : z \mapsto -z$, (2) $\tau : z \mapsto z$, (3) $\tau : z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2$. Thus we find $K(\zeta)(N)^{\langle \tau \rangle} = K(\zeta)(z_1, \ldots, z_a, z'_1, z'_2, \ldots, z'_b, z''_1, w''_1, \ldots, z''_c, w''_c)$ where $\tau : z_1 \mapsto 1/z_1$, …, $z_a \mapsto 1/z_a$, $z'_1 \mapsto z'_1$, …, $z'_b \mapsto z'_b$, $z''_1 \leftrightarrow w''_1$, …, $z''_c \leftrightarrow z''_c$.

By Theorem 3.1 we may "neglect" the roles of $z'_1, \ldots, z'_b, z''_1, w''_1, \ldots, z''_c, w''_c$. We may linearize the action on $z_1, \ldots, z_a$ by defining $w_i = 1/(1 + z_i)$ when $1 \le i \le a$. Then

$\tau : w_i \mapsto -w_i + 1$. Thus we may "neglect" the roles of w_i by Theorem 3.1 again. In conclusion, $K(\zeta)(z_1, \ldots, z_a, z'_1, \ldots, z'_b, z''_1, w''_1, \ldots, z''_c, w''_c)^{\langle \tau \rangle}$ is rational over K. $\square$

Case 2. $G = \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4 : \sigma_i^p = 1,\ \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in Z(G),\ \sigma_4^{-1}\sigma_3\sigma_4 = \sigma_1\sigma_3 \rangle$.

The proof is very similar to Case 1.

Step 1. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, define $x_{0,i}, x_{1,i}, y_{0,i}, y_{1,i} \in \bigoplus_{g \in G} K(\zeta) \cdot x(g)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{0,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{-j-k-l} x(\sigma_4^i \sigma_3^j \sigma_1^k \sigma_2^l),\\
x_{1,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{j+k+l} x(\sigma_4^i \sigma_3^j \sigma_1^k \sigma_2^l),\\
y_{0,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{-j-k+l} x(\sigma_4^i \sigma_3^j \sigma_1^k \sigma_2^l),\\
y_{1,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{j+k-l} x(\sigma_4^i \sigma_3^j \sigma_1^k \sigma_2^l).
\end{aligned}$$

The action of $\langle G, \tau \rangle$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_1 :&\ x_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-1} x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-1} y_{1,i},\\
\sigma_2 :&\ x_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-1} x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-1} y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta y_{1,i},\\
\sigma_3 :&\ x_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta^{i+1} x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-i-1} x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i} \mapsto \zeta^{i+1} y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i} \mapsto \zeta^{-i-1} y_{1,i},\\
\sigma_4 :&\ x_{0,i} \mapsto x_{0,i+1},\ x_{1,i} \mapsto x_{1,i+1},\ y_{0,i} \mapsto y_{0,i+1},\ y_{1,i} \mapsto y_{1,i+1},\\
\tau :&\ x_{0,i} \leftrightarrow x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i} \leftrightarrow y_{1,i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i}$ where $i \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ are linearly independent vectors in $\bigoplus_{g \in G} K(\zeta) \cdot x(g)$. Apply Theorem 3.1. It suffices to consider the rationality problem of $K(\zeta)(x_{0,i}, x_{1,i}, y_{0,i}, y_{1,i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_p)^{\langle G, \tau \rangle}$.

Step 2. Define $x_0 = x_{0,0}^p$, $y_0 = x_{0,0}x_{1,0}$, $X_0 = y_{0,0}(x_{0,0})^{-1}$, $Y_0 = y_{1,0}(x_{1,0})^{-1}$; for $1 \le i \le p-1$, define $x_i = x_{0,i}(x_{0,i-1})^{-1}$, $y_i = x_{1,i}(x_{1,i-1})^{-1}$, $X_i = y_{0,i}(y_{0,i-1})^{-1}$, $Y_i =$

$y_{1,i}(y_{1,i-1})^{-1}$. Then $K(\zeta)(x_{0,i},x_{1,i},y_{0,i},y_{1,i}:i\in\mathbb{Z}_p)^{\langle\sigma_1\rangle}=K(\zeta)(x_i,\ y_i,X_i,Y_i:i\in\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and the actions are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_2:\ & x_0\mapsto x_0,\ y_0\mapsto y_0,\ X_0\mapsto\zeta^{-2}X_0,\ Y_0\mapsto\zeta^2Y_0,\\
& \text{All the other generators are fixed by }\ \sigma_2;\\
\sigma_3:\ & x_0\mapsto x_0,\ y_0\mapsto y_0,\ X_0\mapsto X_0,\ Y_0\mapsto Y_0,\\
& x_i\mapsto\zeta x_i,\ y_i\mapsto\zeta^{-1}y_i,\ X_i\mapsto\zeta X_i,\ Y_i\mapsto\zeta^{-1}Y_i,\\
\sigma_4:\ & x_0\mapsto x_0x_1^p,\ y_0\mapsto y_0y_1x_1,\ X_0\mapsto X_0X_1x_1^{-1},\ Y_0\mapsto Y_0Y_1y_1^{-1},\\
& x_1\mapsto x_2\mapsto x_3\mapsto\cdots\mapsto x_{p-1}\mapsto(x_1x_2\cdots x_{p-1})^{-1},\\
& \text{Similarly for }\ y_1,y_2,\ldots,y_{p-1},X_1,\ldots,X_{p-1},Y_1,\ldots,Y_{p-1};\\
\tau:\ & x_0\mapsto y_0^px_0^{-1},\ y_0\mapsto y_0,\ X_0\mapsto Y_0\mapsto X_0,\\
& x_i\leftrightarrow y_i,\ X_i\leftrightarrow Y_i\ \text{ for }\ 1\le i\le p-1.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 3. Define $\tilde{x}=x_0y_0^{-(p-1)/2}$, $\tilde{y}=x_0^{-1}y_0^{(p+1)/2}$.

Since $\tilde{x}$, $\tilde{y}$ are fixed by both σ_2 and σ_3, while $\sigma_4:\tilde{x}\mapsto\alpha\tilde{x}$, $\tilde{y}\mapsto\beta\tilde{y}$, $\tau:\tilde{x}\leftrightarrow\tilde{y}$ where $\alpha,\beta\in K(x_1,y_1,X_1,Y_1)\backslash\{0\}$, we may apply Theorem 3.1. Thus the roles of $\tilde{x}$, $\tilde{y}$ may be "neglected". It suffices to consider whether $K(\zeta)(X_0,Y_0,x_i,y_i,X_i,Y_i:1\le i\le p-1)^{\langle\sigma_2,\sigma_3,\sigma_4,\tau\rangle}$ is rational over K.

Step 4. Define $\widetilde{X}=X_0^p$, $\widetilde{Y}=X_0Y_0$. Then $K(\zeta)(X_0,Y_0,x_i,y_i,X_i,Y_i:1\le i\le p-1)^{\langle\sigma_2\rangle}=K(\zeta)(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{Y},x_i,y_i,X_i,Y_i:1\le i\le p-1)$. Moreover, the actions on $\widetilde{X}$ and $\widetilde{Y}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_3:\ & \widetilde{X}\mapsto\widetilde{X},\ \widetilde{Y}\mapsto\widetilde{Y},\\
\sigma_4:\ & \widetilde{X}\mapsto\widetilde{X}X_1^px_1^{-p},\ \widetilde{Y}\mapsto\widetilde{Y}X_1Y_1x_1^{-1}y_1^{-1},\\
\tau:\ & \widetilde{X}\mapsto\widetilde{X}^{-1}\widetilde{Y}^p,\ \widetilde{Y}\mapsto\widetilde{Y}.
\end{aligned}$$

Define $X'=\widetilde{X}\widetilde{Y}^{-(p-1)/2}$, $Y'=\widetilde{X}^{-1}\widetilde{Y}^{(p+1)/2}$. As in Step 3, we may apply Theorem 3.1 and "neglect" the roles of X' and Y'. It remains to make sure whether

$K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i, X_i, Y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \sigma_3, \sigma_4, \tau \rangle}$ is rational.

Define $u_0 = x_1^p$, $v_0 = x_1 y_1$; for $1 \le i \le p-2$, define $u_i = x_{i+1}(x_i^{-1})$, $v_i = y_{i+1} \cdot (y_i^{-1})$; and for $1 \le i \le p-1$, define $U_i = X_i x_i^{-1}$, $V_i = Y_i y_i^{-1}$. It follows that $K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i, X_i, Y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \sigma_3 \rangle} = K(\zeta)(u_0, v_0, U_{p-1}, V_{p-1}, u_i, v_i, U_i, V_i : 1 \le i \le p-2)$. Note that the actions of σ_4 and τ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_4 :\ & u_0 \mapsto u_0 u_1^p,\ v_0 \mapsto v_0 v_1 u_1,\ u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_{p-2} \mapsto (u_0 u_1^{p-1} u_2^{p-2} \cdots u_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\
& v_1 \mapsto v_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto v_{p-2} \mapsto u_0 (v_0^p v_1^{p-1} \cdots v_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\
& U_1 \mapsto U_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto U_{p-1} \mapsto (U_1 U_2 \cdots U_{p-1})^{-1}, \\
& V_1 \mapsto V_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto V_{p-1} \mapsto (V_1 V_2 \cdots V_{p-1})^{-1}. \\
\tau :\ & u_0 \mapsto u_0^{-1} v_0^p,\ v_0 \mapsto v_0,\ u_i \leftrightarrow v_i \ \text{ for }\ 1 \le i \le p-2, \\
& U_i \leftrightarrow V_i \ \text{ for }\ 1 \le i \le p-1.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the actions of σ_4 and τ on $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_{p-1}, V_1, \ldots, V_{p-1}$ may be linearized by the same method as in Step 9 of Case 1. Hence we may apply Theorem 3.1 and "neglect" the roles of U_i, V_i for $1 \le i \le p-1$.

In conclusion, all we need is to prove that $K(\zeta)(u_i, v_i : 0 \le i \le p-2)^{\langle \sigma_4, \tau \rangle}$ is rational over K.

Compare the present situation with that of Step 5 of Case 1. We have the same generators and the same actions (and even the same notation). Thus we finish the proof. □

Case 3. $G = \langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4 : \sigma_i^p = 1,\ \sigma_1 \in Z(G),\ \sigma_2\sigma_3 = \sigma_3\sigma_2,\ \sigma_4^{-1}\sigma_2\sigma_4 = \sigma_1\sigma_2,\ \sigma_4^{-1}\sigma_3\sigma_4 = \sigma_2\sigma_3 \rangle$.

Step 1. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, define $x_{0,i}, x_{1,i}, y_{0,i}, y_{1,i} \in \bigoplus_{g \in G} K(\zeta) \cdot x(g)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{0,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{-j-k-l} x(\sigma_4^i \sigma_3^j \sigma_2^k \sigma_1^l), \\
x_{1,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{j+k+l} x(\sigma_4^i \sigma_3^j \sigma_2^k \sigma_1^l),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} y_{0,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l\in\mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{-j-k+l} x(\sigma_4^i\sigma_3^j\sigma_2^k\sigma_1^l), \\ y_{1,i} &= \sum_{j,k,l\in\mathbb{Z}_p} \zeta^{j+k-l} x(\sigma_4^i\sigma_3^j\sigma_2^k\sigma_1^l). \end{aligned}$$

The action of $\langle G,\tau\rangle$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 &: \ x_{0,i}\mapsto \zeta x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i}\mapsto \zeta^{-1}x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i}\mapsto \zeta^{-1}y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i}\mapsto \zeta y_{1,i}, \\ \sigma_2 &: \ x_{0,i}\mapsto \zeta^{i+1}x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i}\mapsto \zeta^{-i-1}x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i}\mapsto \zeta^{-i+1}y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i}\mapsto \zeta^{i-1}y_{1,i}, \\ \sigma_3 &: \ x_{0,i}\mapsto \zeta^{i+1}x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i}\mapsto \zeta^{-i-1}x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i}\mapsto \zeta^{i+1}y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i}\mapsto \zeta^{-i-1}y_{1,i}, \\ \sigma_4 &: \ x_{0,i}\mapsto x_{0,i+1},\ x_{1,i}\mapsto x_{1,i+1},\ y_{0,i}\mapsto y_{0,i+1},\ y_{1,i}\mapsto y_{1,i+1}, \\ \tau &: \ x_{0,i}\leftrightarrow x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i}\leftrightarrow y_{1,i}. \end{aligned}$$

Checking the restriction of $\langle\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3\rangle$ as in Step 1 of Case 2, we find that these vectors $x_{0,i},\ x_{1,i},\ y_{0,i},\ y_{1,i}$ are linearly independent except possibly for the case $x_{0,p-2}$ and $y_{1,0}$, and the case $x_{1,p-2}$ and $y_{0,0}$. But it is easy to see that these vectors are linearly independent, because their "supports" are disjoint. Apply Theorem 3.1. It suffices to consider $K(\zeta)(x_{0,i},x_{1,i},y_{0,i},y_{1,i} : i\in\mathbb{Z}_p)^{\langle G,\tau\rangle}$.

Step 2. Define $x_0=x_{0,0}^p$, $y_0=x_{0,0}x_{1,0}$, $X_0=x_{0,0}\cdot y_{0,0}$, $Y_0=x_{1,0}y_{1,0}$; and for $1\le i\le p-1$, define $x_i=x_{0,i}(x_{0,i-1})^{-1}$, $y_i=x_{1,i}(x_{1,i-1})^{-1}$, $X_i=y_{0,i}(y_{0,i-1})^{-1}$, $Y_i=y_{1,i}(y_{1,i-1})^{-1}$. Then $K(\zeta)(x_{0,i},x_{1,i},y_{0,i},y_{1,i} : i\in\mathbb{Z}_p)^{\langle\sigma_1\rangle}=K(\zeta)(x_i,y_i,X_i,Y_i : i\in\mathbb{Z}_p)$ and the actions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_2 &: \ x_0\mapsto x_0,\ y_0\mapsto y_0,\ X_0\mapsto \zeta^2X_0,\ Y_0\mapsto\zeta^{-2}Y_0, \\ &\quad\ x_i\mapsto \zeta x_i,\ y_i\mapsto\zeta^{-1}y_i,\ X_i\mapsto\zeta^{-1}X_i,\ Y_i\mapsto\zeta Y_i, \\ \sigma_3 &: \ x_0\mapsto x_0,\ y_0\mapsto y_0,\ X_0\mapsto \zeta^2X_0,\ Y_0\mapsto\zeta^{-2}Y_0, \\ &\quad\ x_i\mapsto \zeta x_i,\ y_i\mapsto\zeta^{-1}y_i,\ X_i\mapsto\zeta X_i,\ Y_i\mapsto\zeta^{-1}Y_i, \\ \sigma_4 &: \ x_0\mapsto x_0x_1^p,\ y_0\mapsto y_0y_1X_1,\ X_0\mapsto X_0X_1x_1,\ Y_0\mapsto Y_0Y_1y_1, \\ &\quad\ x_1\mapsto x_2\mapsto x_3\mapsto\cdots\mapsto x_{p-1}\mapsto (x_1x_2\cdots x_{p-1})^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Similarly for } \ y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{p-1}, X_1, \ldots, X_{p-1}, Y_1, \ldots, Y_{p-1}. \\ \tau: \ \ & x_0 \mapsto y_0^p x_0^{-1}, \ y_0 \mapsto y_0, \ X_0 \mapsto Y_0 \mapsto X_0, \\ & x_i \leftrightarrow y_i, \ X_i \leftrightarrow Y_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le p-1. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. Define $\tilde{x} = x_0 y_0^{-(p-1)/2}$, $\tilde{y} = x_0^{-1} y_0^{(p+1)/2}$. Apply Theorem 3.1 again. It suffices to consider $K(\zeta)(X_0, Y_0, x_i, y_i, X_i, Y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4, \tau \rangle}$.

We may apply Theorem 3.1 again to "neglect" X_0 and Y_0. Thus it suffices to consider $K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i, X_i, Y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \sigma_4, \tau \rangle}$.

Step 4. Define $u_0 = x_1^p$, $v_0 = x_1 y_1$, $U_0 = x_1 X_1$, $V_0 = y_1 Y_1$; and for $1 \le i \le p-2$, define $u_i = x_i^{-1} x_{i+1}$, $v_i = y_i^{-1} y_{i+1}$, $U_i = X_i^{-1} X_{i+1}$, $V_i = Y_i^{-1} Y_{i+1}$. Then $K(\zeta)(x_i, y_i, X_i, Y_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^{\langle \sigma_2 \rangle} = K(\zeta)(u_i, v_i, U_i, V_i : 0 \le i \le p-2)$. Note that the actions of σ_3, σ_4, τ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_3: \ \ & u_0 \mapsto u_0, \ v_0 \mapsto v_0, \ U_0 \mapsto \zeta^2 U_0, \ V_0 \mapsto \zeta^{-2} U_0, \\ & \text{All the other generators are fixed by } \ \sigma_3. \\ \sigma_4: \ \ & u_0 \mapsto u_0 u_1^p, \ v_0 \mapsto v_0 v_1 u_1, \ U_0 \mapsto U_0 U_1 u_1, \ V_0 \mapsto V_0 V_1 v_1, \\ & u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_{p-2} \mapsto (u_0 u_1^{p-1} u_2^{p-2} \cdots u_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\ & v_1 \mapsto v_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto v_{p-2} \mapsto u_0 (v_0^p v_1^{p-1} \cdots v_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\ & U_1 \mapsto U_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto U_{p-2} \mapsto u_0 (U_0^p U_1^{p-1} \cdots U_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\ & V_1 \mapsto V_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto V_{p-2} \mapsto u_0^{-1} v_0^p (V_0^p V_1^{p-1} \cdots V_{p-2}^2)^{-1}, \\ \tau: \ \ & u_0 \mapsto v_0^p u_0^{-1}, \ v_0 \mapsto v_0, \ U_0 \mapsto V_0 \mapsto U_0, \\ & u_i \leftrightarrow v_i, \ U_i \leftrightarrow V_i \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le p-2. \end{aligned}$$

Step 5. Define $R_0 = U_0^p$, $S_0 = U_0 V_0$; and for $1 \le i \le p-2$, define $R_i = U_i$, $S_i = V_i$. Then $K(\zeta)(u_i, v_i, U_i, V_i : 0 \le i \le p-2)^{\langle \sigma_3 \rangle} = K(\zeta)(u_i, v_i, R_i, S_i : 0 \le i \le p-2)$. We will write the actions of σ_4 and τ on R_i, S_i as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_4 :\ & R_0 \mapsto R_0R_1^pu_1^p,\ S_0 \mapsto S_0S_1R_1u_1v_1,\\ & R_1 \mapsto R_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto R_{p-2} \mapsto u_0(R_0R_1^{p-1}R_2^{p-2}\cdots R_{p-2}^2)^{-1},\\ & S_1 \mapsto S_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto S_{p-2} \mapsto u_0^{-1}v_0^pR_0(S_0^pS_1^{p-1}\cdots S_{p-2}^2)^{-1},\\ \tau :\ & R_0 \mapsto S_0^pR_0^{-1},\ S_0 \mapsto S_0,\ R_i \leftrightarrow S_i \text{ for } 1 \le i \le p-2.\end{aligned}$$

Step 6. Imitate the change of variables in Step 6 of Case 1. We define $u_{p-1} = (u_0u_1^{p-1}u_2^{p-2}\cdots u_{p-2}^2)^{-1}$, $R_{p-1} = u_0(R_0R_1^{p-1}R_2^{p-2}\cdots R_{p-2}^2)^{-1}$; and for $1 \le i \le p-2$, define $w_i = v_0v_1\cdots v_iu_1u_2\cdots u_i$, $T_i = S_0S_1\cdots S_iR_1R_2\cdots R_i$; define $w_{p-1} = (v_0^{p-1} v_1^{p-2}\cdots v_{p-2}u_1^{p-2}u_2^{p-3}\cdots u_{p-2})^{-1}$, $T_{p-1} = u_1v_1v_0^p(S_0^{p-1}S_1^{p-2}\cdots S_{p-2}R_1^{p-2}R_2^{p-3}\cdots R_{p-2})^{-1}$.

We find that $K(u_i, v_i, R_i, S_i : 0 \le i \le p-2) = K(u_i, w_i, R_i, T_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_4 :\ & u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_{p-1} \mapsto (u_1u_2\cdots u_{p-1})^{-1},\\ & w_1 \mapsto w_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto w_{p-1} \mapsto (w_1w_2\cdots w_{p-1})^{-1},\\ & R_1 \mapsto R_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto R_{p-1} \mapsto (R_1R_2\cdots R_{p-1})^{-1},\\ & T_1 \mapsto T_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto T_{p-1} \mapsto (T_1T_2\cdots T_{p-1})^{-1},\\ \tau :\ & w_i \mapsto w_i,\ T_i \mapsto T_i,\ u_i \mapsto w_i(u_iw_{i-1})^{-1},\ R_i \mapsto T_i(R_iT_{i-1})^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

where we write $w_0 = v_0$, $T_0 = S_0$ for convenience.

Step 7. The multiplicative action in Step 6 can be formulated as follows.

Let $\pi = \langle \tau, \sigma_4 \rangle$ and define a π-lattice as in Step 7 of Case 1 (but σ_3 should be replaced by σ_4 in the present situation). Then $K(\zeta)(u_i, w_i, R_i, T_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)^\pi = K(\zeta)(M \oplus M)^\pi$ where M is the same lattice in Step 7 of Case 1.

The structure of M has been determined in Step 7 of Case 1. Thus $M \oplus M \simeq \Lambda \oplus \Lambda$ where $\Lambda \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\pi_1] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[\pi_2]/\Phi_p(\sigma_4)$ where $\pi_1 = \langle \tau \rangle$ and $\pi_2 = \langle \sigma_4 \rangle$. It follows that we can find elements $Y_1, \ldots, Y_{p-1}$, $Z_1, \ldots, Z_{p-1}$, $W_1, \ldots, W_{p-1}$, $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{p-1}$ in the field $K(\zeta)(u_i, w_i, R_i, T_i : 1 \le i \le p-1)$ so that $K(\zeta)(u_i, w_i, R_i, T_i : 1 \le i \le p-1) =$

$K(\zeta)(Y_1,\ldots,Y_{p-1},Z_1,\ldots,Z_{p-1},W_1,\ldots,W_{p-1},Q_1,\ldots,Q_{p-1})$ and the actions of σ_4 and τ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_4:\ & Y_1\mapsto\cdots\mapsto Y_{p-1}\mapsto(Y_1Y_2\cdots Y_{p-1})^{-1},\\
& \text{Similarly for }\ Z_1,\ldots,Z_{p-1},\ W_1,\ldots,W_{p-1},\ Q_1,\ldots,Q_{p-1};\\
\tau:\ & Y_i\leftrightarrow Z_i,\ W_i\leftrightarrow Q_i.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 8. We can linearize the actions of σ_4 and τ by the same method in Step 9 of Case 1. Apply Theorem 3.1. We may "neglect" the roles of W_i, Q_i. Thus the present situation is the same as in Step 8 of Case 1. $\square$

References

[CHK] H. Chu, S. J. Hu and M. Kang, *Noether's problem for dihedral 2-groups*, Comment. Math. Helv. **79** (2004) 147–159.

[CK] H. Chu and M. Kang, *Rationality of p-group actions*, J. Algebra **237** (2001) 673–690.

[CTS] J. L. Colliot-Thélène and J. J. Sansuc, *La R-equivalence sur les tores*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **101** (1977) 175–230.

[DM] F. DeMeyer and T. McKenzie, *On generic polynomials*, J. Algebra **261** (2003) 327–333.

[GMS] S. Garibaldi, A. Merkurjev and J. -P. Serre, *Cohomologocal invariants in Galois cohomology*, AMS University Lecture Series vol. 28, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence 2003.

[Ha] M. Hajja, *Rational invariants of meta-abelian groups of linear automorphisms*, J. Algebra **80** (1983) 295–305.

[HK1] M. Hajja and M. Kang, *Three-dimensional purely monomial group actions*, J. Algebra **170** (1994) 805–860.

[HK2] M. Hajja and M. Kang, *Some actions of symmetric groups*, J. Algebra **177** (1995) 511–535.

[HuK] S. J. Hu and M. Kang, *Noether's problem for some p-groups*, preprint.

[ILF] V. V. Ishkhanov, B. B. Luré and D. K. Faddeev, *The embedding problem in Galois theory*, Transl. Math. Monographs vol. 165, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1997.

[Ka1] M. Kang, *A note on cyclotomic polynomials*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **29** (1999) 893–907.

[Ka2] M. Kang, *Introduction to Noether's problem for dihedral groups*, Algebra Colloq. **11** (2004) 71–78.

[Ka3] M. Kang, *Noether's problem for dihedral 2-groups II*, to appear in "Pacific J. Math.".

[Ka4] M. Kang, *Noether's problem for metacyclic p-groups*, to appear in "Advances in Math.".

[Ke] I. Kersten, *Noether's problem and normalization*, Jber. Deutsch. Math.-Verein. **100** (1998) 3–22.

[Le] H. W. Lenstra, *Rational functions invariant under a finite abelian group*, Invent. Math. **25** (1974) 299–325.

[Lo] M. Lorenz, *Multiplicative invariant theory*, Encyclo. Math. Sciences vol. 135, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

[Re] I. Reiner, *Integral representations of cyclic groups of prime order*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (1957) 142–146.

[Sa1] D. J. Saltman, *Generic Galois extensions and problems in field theory*, Adv. Math. **43** (1982) 250–283.

[Sa2] D. J. Saltman, *Noether's problem over an algebraically closed field*, Invent. Math. **77** (1984) 71–84.

[Sa3] D. J. Saltman, *Retract rational fields and cyclic Galois extensions*, Israel J. Math. **47** (1984) 165–215.

[Sa4] D. J. Saltman, *Galois groups of order* p^3, Comm. Algebra **15** (1987) 1365–1373.

[Sa5] D. J. Saltman, *Twisted multiplicative field invariants, Noether's problem, and Galois extensions*, J. Algebra **131** (1990) 555–558.

[Se] J. -P. Serre, Collected papers, vol. IV 1985–1998, Springer-Verlag, New York 2000.

[Sw1] R. G. Swan, *Invariant rational functions and a problem of Steenrod*, Invent. Math. **7** (1969) 148–158.

[Sw2] R. G. Swan, *Noether's problem in Galois theory*, in "Emmy Noether in Bryn Mawr", edited by B. Srinivasan and J. Sally, Springer-Verlag, 1983, New York.

[Sw3] R. G. Swan, *The flabby class group of a finite cyclic group*, http://www.math.uchicago.edu/swan

[Vo] V. E. Voskresenskii, *Algebraic groups and their birational invariants*, Transl. Math. Monographs vol. 179, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1998.